DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 410 246 TM 026 988

AUTHOR Loving, Cathleen C.; And Others
TITLE The Evolution of a Research Design: Evaluating Professional Development Schools in the NEA Teacher Education Initiative.
PUB DATE Mar 97
NOTE 72p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 24-28, 1997).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; Curriculum Development; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Longitudinal Studies; *Partnerships in Education; *Professional Development Schools; Program Evaluation; *Research Design; School Restructuring; *Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS *National Education Association; Reform Efforts; Texas A and M University

ABSTRACT

There is growing evidence that establishing school-university partnerships for the purpose of restructuring schools has impacts on teacher education, the elementary and secondary curriculum, and the knowledge base that undergirds the profession. In 1988 the National Education Association (NEA) created the Teacher Education Initiative (TEI) to achieve comprehensive reform in education with a major focus on program curriculum evaluation and delivery aspects associated with the professional development of teachers in Professional Development Schools (PDS) where schools and universities cooperate for educational improvement. This paper explores the initial years of the NEA-TEI research process. Part I describes the research that led to a better understanding of what successful school and university partnerships entail and their characteristics and components. Part II is a description of a seven-site longitudinal research design, and first-year results, from the first exploration of the operation of these partnerships and eight other principles of the TEI. Part III provides a detailed look at how one of the sites in the longitudinal study, Texas A&M University, adapted and used the research design in three of its PDS in the first evaluation year. Overall, partnership has had positive effects on all partner institutions. Although the partnerships for teacher education required great time commitments from all partners, the benefits to students outweighed the negatives. (Contains 14 tables and 15 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 410 246

The Evolution of a Research Design: Evaluating Professional Development Schools in the NEA Teacher Education Initiative

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Cathleen Loving

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

presented by:

Cathleen C. Loving, Texas A&M University
Donna L. Wiseman, Northern Illinois University
Donna D. Cooner, Texas A&M University
Allan Sterbin, University of Memphis
Sylvia Seidel, National Education Association

For the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting PDS-SIG
March 26, 1997, Chicago, IL

TM026988

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Evolution of a Research Design: Evaluating Professional Development Schools in the NEA Teacher Education Initiative

Introduction

There is growing evidence that establishing school-universities partnerships for the purpose of restructuring schools impacts teacher education, elementary, and secondary curriculum, and the knowledge base that undergirds the profession (Goodlad, 1995). The partnerships provide a context where university faculty, teachers and administrators can systematically change the way they and their students work and provide relevant professional development for beginning and experienced teachers. The schools and universities that enter into long-term, complex relationships to bring about reforms in education are often referred to as partner schools or Professional Development Schools. The term professional development schools (PDS) was first derived by the Holmes Group in 1986 envisioned the collaborations of higher education and P-12 as ones that

> "would provide superior opportunities for teachers and administrators to influence the development of their profession, and for university faculty to increase the professional relevance of their work through 1)mutual deliberation on problems with student learning, and their possible solutions; 2) shared teaching in the university and schools; 3) collaborative research on the problems of educational practice; and 4) cooperative supervision of prospective teachers and administrators (Holmes Group, 1986, p. 56). "

During the past ten years. PDS's have been at the center of efforts which encourage and support the simultaneous reform of school and university teaching and learning. The promises and possibilities of PDS have been embraced by numerous educational groups and educational leaders throughout the country. There is general acceptance that partnerships between schools and universities provide a context for 1) quality instruction for K-12 students, the preparation of prospective teachers, and the continuing education of

professional educators; 2) research that informs the teaching profession; and 3) structural and organizational school and university reform. PDS's are called upon to develop and demonstrate exemplary practice and disseminate new knowledge gained from collaborative efforts (Book, 1996).

As school university partnerships evolve and play a more important role in the educational process, it is important to monitor their developmental processes in order to fully understand the patterns that emerge (Auger & Odell, 1992). Understanding the processes associated with these efforts can bring about a greater understanding of the change process and systematic study of the patterns, promises, and pitfalls of the partnerships that are currently being implemented can lead to continued further success. A healthy inquiry process provides formative information for revising and improving the joint processes and summative information that allows institutions to evaluate the outcomes of the partnership.

Research and inquiry are recognized as necessary components in professional development school setting; however, the ways research and inquiry are conducted may be different than the traditional university models. For one thing, partnerships require that schools and universities jointly participate in the design, question formation, implementation, analysis, and dissemination of inquiry (Hunkins, Wiseman, & Williams, 1995). By their very nature, PDS settings alter the "rules, roles and relationships" of involved parties so that existing or new purposes can be served more effectively (Schlechty, 1991, p.xvi). The nature of research and inquiry is one traditional activity that is changed and challenged by partner school relationships.

There are continuous calls to systematically collect and analyze data produced in the school-university settings and research is beginning to emerge from school-university settings (Book, 1996). Still some difficult questions remain. The potential for long term sustainability of partnerships, impact on student achievement, contribution to teacher quality, and implementation and institutionalization of school-university partnerships

represent a few of the important issues needing insightful answers. This paper will describe one inquiry effort which considers some of the difficult to answer questions emerging from PDS contexts.

Teacher Education Initiative

In 1988 the National Education Association (NEA) created the Teacher Education Initiative (TEI) to "achieve comprehensive reform in education from preschool experiences through doctoral programs (NEA, 1995). The major focus of the TEI is " the analysis of program curriculum evaluation and delivery aspects associated with the professional development of teachers in Professional Development Schools." A PDS school was identified by NEA as "a collaborative partnership to improve the quality of education offered to all students. Partnerships include P-12 schools, institutions of higher education, teacher associations and communities." (NEA, 1995).

NEA set out to identify school-university sites who were willing to work together for at least five years by forming a NEA-TEI network. In 1991, a national application and selection process was conducted in order to identify sites where innovation was occurring and who would be willing to take on a long-term partnership with NEA. School-university partners applied to be selected as a site which could provide evidence of " significant restructuring of teacher education "(NEA, 1995). After an extensive review of nearly one-hundred applications, seven school-university partnerships from around the country were selected to participate in the initiative. Each sites was unique in setting, processes, and size, but held a common commitment to establishing school-university partnerships and changing the way they went about preparing teachers and teaching young people in their schools.

The sites addressed their efforts related to each of nine principles guiding the NEA-TEI network (See Appendix A). The principles were "unpacked", reformulated, and evaluated by teams from each of the sites in the first national meeting held in Washington DC in 1992. The nine principles continue to serve as guidelines for every aspect of the

partnership work. While the NEA-TEI principles focus attention on almost every aspect of school-university reform, considerable efforts have been directed toward developing and implementing a national model of evaluation and research. The work of a TEI task force has resulted in the development of a research and evaluation protocol designed for partnerships settings.

This paper attempts to capture the nature, design, challenges and learnings of the initial years of the NEA-TEI research process. This paper has three parts.....
Cathy, omit first two paragraphs under Background for Part I: I included most of that in the intro.

Three-Part Focus:

There are three parts to this paper, each building on the previous one. Part I describes the research which led to a better understanding of what successful school-university partnerships entail, what their characteristics and necessary components are, and what categories these fall into. Part II is a description of a seven-site, longitudinal research design--as well as first-year results--that came out of our initial work looking at partnerships, as well as eight other principles of the NEA-Teacher Education Initiative. Part III provides the reader with a detailed look at how one of those sites in the longitudinal study--Texas A&M University--adapted and used the research design with its professional development schools in the first evaluation year.

Background for Part I: A Seventeen-University Look at "Partnerships"

We sometimes see in-depth, qualitative research using one or two sites that helps us decide what might be crucial in these unique partnerships, such as the need for trust, communication, shared goals, and opportunities to collaborate (Wiseman and Nason, 1995) . While such studies give us a brief glimpse of the big picture, it is a rare opportunity to do research on such complex, expensive undertakings on a large scale. Such is the opportunity with the seventeen sites comprising the Teacher Education Initiative. Despite the activity across the nation, there are, according to Goodlad, still .."no blueprints to

guide the building of school-university partnerships--only lessons from the field. The more careful the probe, the more useful the lesson" (Shen, 1993, p. iii). We have a unique opportunity to study the development of partnerships in our seventeen-university TEI team, and, perhaps, contribute to that blueprint.

First, seventeen universities and colleges previously selected by NEA through written grant proposals as either exemplary (10) or restructuring sites (7) each wrote a chapter about their efforts to develop and maintain professional development schools in their teacher education program. (The seven-site "restructuring" designation was reserved for those deemed farthest along in the professional development school model.)

Each chapter was written by one or more of the key team members from each of the sites. These descriptions are currently available as a resource guide (NEA, 1996). Each site chapter is written in terms of how each of the nine principles is addressed. Sites (all of whom were already guaranteed funding for the duration of the grant) were encouraged to be honest about the level of success with each principle and were told they were not expected to be able to show strength with all nine principles at this point in their project. As an example, some sites, like Wyoming and Texas A&M, wrote detailed descriptions of their emphasis on technology--as it was clearly an active principle and a priority at those two sites. Likewise, certain institutions provided particularly rich descriptions of their work with "partnerships." Sometimes these were long and detailed, or they were full of varied examples of the partnership in action.

Methods

Just a cursory look at the seventeen chapters enabled the research team to come up with a stack of seven chapters whose writers had a variety of things to tell us about the partnership principle. Another six or seven were less detailed but had at least one unique aspect to their partnership effort. The initial screening resulted in our concentrating on fourteen site's chapters for a closer look at what the content was telling us.

Our research team read the section on "partnerships" from each institution and analyzed the description using grounded-theory methods (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). We were interested in coding and categorizing each phrase in each paragraph on partnerships.

The key question guiding our data collection and analysis--which are closely intertwined in this kind of research--was: What are the necessary ingredients, criteria, characteristics or methods common to sites whose descriptions claim to have, or read as if they have, "successful" school-university partnerships (if we define "successful" partnerships as those with relatively rich descriptions appearing to move towards better teacher education and better learning environments for students and teachers. We avoided the adjective " effective" as it connotes to us a more comprehensive look at teacher and student outcomes, which some sites appearing "successful" were not yet ready to claim.

What was also helpful after we began open coding of the phrases on partnerships was the use of axial coding (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). This assisted us in categorizing data after the initial coding by looking at partnerships in terms of: What events lead to them? What set of conditions seem necessary for them to occur? What structural conditions bear on the existence of successful partnerships? What strategies help manage, handle and carry out partnerships? and finally, What outcomes result from successful partnerships? (p. 99-107).

Then, at a national meeting where many of the seventeen universities were in attendance, representatives from some of these apparently successful partnership sites were given our descriptive analyses to either verify or to suggest corrections. We were able to conduct a focus group with members of seven sites in order to critically question, clarify, expand or in some cases update the original descriptions. We were particularly interested, now that we had some successful partnerships identified, in obtaining vignettes and other first-person accounts which might enhance our understanding.

We were then able to assemble our description and examples of effective partnerships in terms of four broad categories appearing to be necessary to achieve this

level of effectiveness. These categories stressed actions taken in partnerships, not just methods espoused without corroborating evidence. We then compared our emerging categories to existing partnership research, to see how well our perspective from the various NEA-TEI sites was supported by the literature.

Results

Four categories emerged from our research, each apparently representing an important characteristic which appears to be common in achieving successful school-university partnerships among the seventeen sites. These are 1) an effort towards simultaneous renewal through use of strategic planning and strongly articulated, long-term goals; 2) use of the insights gained from research on the change process; 3) an absolute focus on field-based experiences for pre-service teachers and continuing development for practicing teachers; and 4) an up front, proactive attitude about dealing with money, time and other resources--a constant focus--but addressed early in the partnership.

In each of the four cases, we were able to find research support for our emerging categories.

Category 1: While TEI teacher education partnerships come in many varieties and intensities, the successful ones are based on *shared commitment to educational renewal.*. This commitment usually focuses on the improvement of curriculum, instruction, assessment and restructuring the school/university culture. The depth and explicitness of the shared understandings can determine how enduring the partnerships become over the longer term.

Partners' commitments are usually expressed in missions, visions, goals, and/or the precise focus a partnership agrees upon. Often national networks define partnership work and offer goals, agendas, and support (Book, 1996) for many of the sites in the TEI initiative. The pioneering work of the Holmes Group, John Goodlad's National Network for Educational Renewal, Danforth Foundation, Sizer's Coalition for Essential Schools, NEA Teacher Education Initiative are examples of national groups which encourage local

and state support for school-university partnerships, with emphasis on this idea of shared commitment to renewal.

Category 2: The descriptions of the processes of school-university partnerships in TEI sites reveal that *the impact of research on the change process has provided important insights.*. School-university partnerships are usually established to create new institutions and new ways of working (Book, 1996, Knight, Wiseman, & Smith, 1992) and there are many descriptions of the stresses that evolve as two institutions work to create "culturally different perceptions..." (Brookhart & Loadman, 1992). There is a great need for developing trust, communication, shared goals, and opportunities to collaborate (Grossman, 1992; Wiseman & Nason, 1995).

The processes and theories related to changes in institutions outside the educational setting become helpful in school-university partnerships. Many of the TEI sites describe specific strategies promoted in the research on organizational behavior--total quality management, strategic planning--and most importantly the notion of continuous improvement in their restructuring efforts (Walton, 1986; Kaufman & Herman, 1991). There is a great deal of evidence offered by TEI sites that the organization and management of school-university partnerships usually involves the evolution of broad-based governance with numerous subgroups involved at various levels.

Category 3: It appears that TEI partnership sites focus on *field-based experiences* for novice teachers and opportunities for continuing development of practicing teachers. Embedding preservice preparation and the continuing education of experienced teachers requires a new culture of inquiry from schools and universities. One concrete example of the new culture is the development of new roles such as the university appointment of clinical faculty partners and adjunct faculty from schools, university faculty spending more time teaching and facilitating field experiences in the schools, and some of the best research and evaluation being done in classrooms by teachers. The impact of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

collaboration shows interesting and often positive effects on both preservice and inservice teachers in school-university partnerships.

In successful partnership schools preservice teachers are viewed as the responsibility of the entire school (Pasch and Pugach, 1990). The impact of the partnership on preservice teachers' experiences suggests that the mentoring and cohort formation often found in a partnership encourages interdependence and a positive attitude about their preparation among preservice teachers (Teitel, 1992; Yeriun & Grossman, 1993). Students in the partnership environment consistently report that they feel a great deal of support by school faculty, university faculty and their peers. The prevailing notion that emerges when sites are doing their best work in this area is that of seamless learning of all teachers--novice and veteran--throughout their lives.

Many teachers working in partnership sites experience new roles and develop different attitudes toward their profession. Because teachers are involved in the decision making directly related to partnership work, many report that they enjoy the increased learning and leadership opportunities, but realize that education reform is a great deal of work and does not offer immediate benefits (Ruscoe & Whitford, 1991). There is still evidence in the current research that even though there are many opportunities available in the partnerships, teachers view their most important roles as the ones related to teaching and learning (Book, 1996).

Category 4: Resources and more specifically *money and time* are continuous discussions in the TEI sites. This theme permeates the research and documentation of partnership work in many settings. Tangible costs unidentified in previous research on partnership activities include time, services, and facilities, (Harris & Harris, 1994) and a great deal of discussion has occurred at the TEI sites regarding which entity bears this cost. TEI sites report that state, federal, and private funds stimulate and support partnership efforts, but even so this issue remains a great concern. Equal to money in importance is the issue of time involved in establishing and maintaining the partnership (Book, 1996; Harris

& Harris, 1994; Wiseman & Nason, 1995). Changes in roles and time management of teachers can create stress as they struggle to support novices as well as nurture their public school students. A study by Neufeld and Freeman (1993) indicates that in spite of the increased time commitment required of them in partnership activities, most teachers still feel the benefits outweigh the increased work. University faculty also face increasing challenges finding the time to travel and stay at school sites, while maintaining their on-campus teaching loads, advising responsibilities and the pressures associated with their research agendas. The degree to which this time spent in schools is valued in the tenure and promotion process varies.

Site Examples of the Four Categories

Category 1: Shared Commitment to Educational Renewal

The impact of national initiatives, the process of initiating and beginning the partnership, and definitions of partnership schools all help measure and describe the shared commitment to educational renewal in the TEI sites.

There is little doubt that national initiatives have helped formulate principles, guidelines, postulates and missions related to school-university partnerships. As each site describes its commitment, such groups as Holmes, Coalition for Essential Schools, National Center for ..(NCREST), and National Network for Educational Renewal are mentioned. One example would be the impact of John Goodlad's National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER). At least a half-dozen of the TEI partnerships are also NNER sites and are guided by the Network's nineteen postulates. Two partnership sites are creating "Centers of Pedagogy," as suggested by Goodlad's (1995) writings. Here a visible entity is created to support and bring together all who are involved in teacher education--faculty in education, the arts and sciences, human services as well as the partnership schools. These centers can encourage adjunct, joint and clinical appointments and also attract external funds. Both the **University of South Carolina and Montclair State** have such centers. Montclair's center offers Faculty Scholarship

Incentives which allow faculty to work up to a six-credit load on the site of a partner school.

Occasionally missions and visions are established by a national emphasis in a particular direction. An interesting example of this is the adoption of the "interagency model," that is the broadening of the definition of schools to include health, social services and human services personnel and perspectives. The **University of Maryland** partnership is a multiple services approach, with education and services being provided for children ages 4-12. The whole emphasis in this environment is to give children a sense of neighborhood within a larger school. **George Mason** is moving in this direction also with a "universal teacher model" that encourages students to become credentialed in three areas: early childhood, special education and English as a Second Language. This certainly models an inter-professional approach to teacher education.

The visions offered by TEI partnerships often have a broader impact and go beyond local settings. **Montclair State** successfully convinced the university to alter the reward system for faculty--rethinking faculty roles and putting into action Ernest Boyer's (1990) restructured vision of university tenure and promotion criteria, which includes the "scholarship of application." The **Montclair State** partnership also petitioned the New Jersey legislature, resulting in the generation of state funding for future partnerships leading to professional development schools.

The origin of a partnership may help reveal or even predict the direction of vision, mission and goals. Partnerships in teacher education work best when all parties believe the results will be an improved teacher education program with multiple related benefits for all partners. Typically these partnerships are started by a university or college expressing interest to a school or a district . Occasionally a school will initiate the partnership, as in the case of the **Wheelock College-Edward Devotion School** partnership. Here two teachers wanting to improve their own professional development and lessen their sense of isolation, while being convinced that teacher education needed to occur more in the

schools, proposed a model to Wheelock. The result was a multi-layer mentoring model with graduate interns, classroom teachers, college supervisors and remediation specialists all working as a team.

Sometimes mutual concerns result in a university and school offering to help each other. A complex partnership was started at South Knoll Elementary School when they became concerned about their scores on a state writing assessment and **Texas A&M** designed a field experience activity which provided tutoring to children in reading and writing. The partnership continually evolved and over 125 university students were welcomed each week--contributing to better reading and writing scores! This led to a cascading effect, other involvements, commitments and the eventual official union of the partners. Three years later 100% of the teachers in the school voted to become involved in a formal partnership agreement.

*A professor in the **University of New Mexico** partnership reminds us that over time their PDS sites began to breed their own, when former UNM interns returned as teachers. "They were totally committed!"*

*A principal in the **University of Southern Carolina** partnership points out how critical parent support is in establishing and maintaining the intent of the collaborative. "When times are tough and some folks are wondering why your school is doing things differently, you can feel isolated without that network."*

Often the nature of TEI school-university collaborations are denoted by established criteria for working together and definitions of partnerships. While the term partnership school has a broad connotation, some sites have rather specific criteria for defining which schools are professional development schools and which are not. **Montclair State,** for example, thinks of PDS's as those schools where there is both a substantial input of money and time and a broad spectrum of collaborative efforts--all focused on renewal. **Texas A&M** divides its partner schools into three categories depending on how many of the following four activities are occurring at the site: preservice preparation, continuing

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

education of practicing teachers, university and school curriculum design and development, and research and evaluation. Those schools with one activity are termed "partnership," those with two or three are "associate partnership," and those with all four are "professional development schools."

Category 2: Impact of Research on the Change Process in Institutions

Those involved in the process of establishing the school-university partnerships often feel they are pioneers without a map. And while there are certainly common aspects emerging from current reform efforts, a variety of strategies, processes and understandings associated with institutional change are used in the TEI partnerships. The partnerships which describe themselves in greatest detail seem to have benefited from strategic planning. Identification of benchmarks, definition of roles, consensus building are terms and concepts generally used to talk about the partnership processes. Often consensus-building processes are used to develop frameworks for change. The **University of Memphis,** for example, from the inception of its partnership, established milestones and benchmarks to help gauge successful change. These include:

- a five-year plan with initial pilot sites moving towards twenty sites,
- clear criteria for partner schools,
- five main tasks of university liaisons, including facilitating a required school improvement plan, and
- four main tasks of clinical faculty involving the school plan, leading roles in supervision, and engaging in their own training and action research.

*A new professor came to the **University of Memphis** in 1992 and was assigned to an inner city school as part of her involvement in the school-university partnership. She says at first teachers seemed confused about what had been agreed to in the partnership regarding a school improvement plan and were sometimes hostile at meetings. "It was clear to me that a lot of teachers don't think university professors know how to teach kids." She goes on, "Slowly they began to trust me." After reading a series of articles in the local*

paper about the problems in the schools. She spoke at the next meeting saying, "I can understand what it takes to get up every morning and come to this school." The teachers clapped!

As student teachers became a regular part of the school landscape, teachers began telling her that some of their kids were talking with student teachers about college and about going to the university themselves someday--a rare topic at this school. The professor knew the partnership was moving in the right direction when, at the beginning of school in her third year of the effort, a teacher's aide came up to her in the hall and said "welcome home."

George Mason is another site with a clearly developed framework. Turning a state-mandated 18-hour limit on teacher education course work and a bachelor's degree requirement into a creative graduate level credential program in middle and early-childhood specialization's, the framework for the developing partnership program included:

- early involvement of lead university and school administrators resulting in joint study teams, joint hiring, and high level collaborative planning;
- development of a course in "teacher as researcher;"
- commitment to understanding each other's cultures by visiting sites around the country involved in similar partnerships;
- creative use of the approved state course guidelines combined with flexible graduate offerings on site;
- creative development of paid internships for full-time graduate students and flexible options for part-timers in a non-paid one semester internship;
- an extensive joint plan for admissions, evaluation, funding, and course revision.

Another example of using good planning strategies is seen in the **Montclair State** partnership. The fact that it has, to date, systematically involved 170 teachers in becoming paid clinical faculty members with university privileges-all of them being provided with summer courses or professional development hours specifically targeting critical thinking

skills (the primary focus of their educational renewal initiative)--shows strategic planning of the highest order.

Some sites have particularly impressive, broad-based governance structures for their partnerships. The **University of Tennessee's** consists of the superintendent, principal, a primary and intermediate teacher, faculty adjunct (university hire in PDS half time), clinical faculty (teacher released half time from school to work with university), the dean of the college of education, the director of teacher education and two community representatives. The **University of Nebraska-Lincoln** has a similarly impressive governance structure in its two partnership programs--one a middle level undergraduate program, the other a graduate, middle level intern program.

Some sites, like **Wheelock College**, are particularly effective at describing how their collaborations result in a high level of ownership and sense of involvement from all partners. In this case they credit having more than one advisory group at a site with numerous task groups staying active and focused. At **George Mason** similar emphasis is placed on a wide array and different layers of people who stay active in the planning and sustained dialogue, resulting in numerous joint ventures such as admission procedures, funding, evaluation plans, and curriculum revisions.

*One principal in the **University of Southern Maine** partnership said his community team found a solution to the frustrating problem of getting the word out to the public about what was going on in the schools and at the university. "The group went from nothing to publishing a newspaper every month. We are in our second year; it is free and found in stores, shopping centers and is very successful. One recent issue, for example, featured a story about a literacy education program in the schools. It was amazing to me, out of a group so broadly represented that they took it on and it worked!"*

Finally, the overarching characteristic (related to understanding the change process) is the built-in awareness that there is great need for continuous improvement. Sites that describe this well, like the **University of Nebraska-Lincoln** build in multi-year

opportunities for students to evaluate clinical experiences, do weekly reflective progress reports and, in the end, self-select in or out of teaching. The **University of Southern Maine** partnership developed a course for PDS teachers on creating continuous improvement teaching portfolios. At a given school they may have fifth year interns for a full year who are "educators-in-training" assisting fourth-year undergraduate student teachers; and both may be helping students in their first and second year field experiences. These layers of mentoring suggest continuous improvement is a high priority for all.

*According to the professor in the **UNM partnership,** "a well trained staff is one key to a successful PDS. Moving them towards 'strategic professional development,' where teachers determine needs and help design their own sessions is critical for continuous improvement."*

Category 3: Field-Based Experiences; Teacher Professional Development

All TEI partnership sites favor increasing intensive, integrated field-based experiences for university students in teacher education. There are many different models for incorporating these in-school experiences. At the **University of Wisconsin at Fall Rivers** two hundred hours a semester of field experiences comprise a two-semester model. In **George Mason University's** post-baccalaureate program, teaching interns are not only out in the schools for extended time, but are at some point in their program legitimately able to serve as substitute teachers for their mentor teachers--saving the district considerable money. (While the interns are paid for substituting, it is not equal to regular substitute pay).

Clearly, one of the pervasive characteristics at numerous TEI sites is the emergence of clinical faculty in the partnership--teachers as mentors, co-teachers in methods courses, supervisors for student teachers, action research leaders and professional development trainers for other teachers.

*A young mentor teacher at South Knoll elementary school in the **Texas A&M** partnership told one of the researchers that she "couldn't believe future teachers looked at*

her as someone with expertise!" "It added so much confidence to her feeling about herself," said the researcher.

It appears that those teachers who assume clinical faculty roles need to be rewarded in some way for this extra time and effort. Sometimes there are stipends, if external money is available or if reallocation from the university and school district occurs. Sometimes free tuition credit towards graduate courses is made available. **The University of Southern Carolina** partnership succeeded with a plan allowing teachers involved with the PDS to either receive tuition credit or add it to a pool for other teachers. At the **University of Wyoming** where some clinical faculty members have been part of that partnership for some time, the focus is now shifting to the intrinsic rewards achievable through involvement with leadership activities and professional development at their regional service centers.

The belief that teaching is a seamless continuum from novice to expert and that all of us are on that continuum may be best illustrated at the **University of New Mexico.** The emphasis here is to eliminate the dichotomy of preservice and inservice. Some examples follow from UNM's secondary program:

- secondary teacher education students are mentored by seven clinical faculty from the Albuquerque Public Schools;
- first year teachers can enter a resident teacher program and receive a stipend while completing a master's degree; if they are first year teachers not pursuing a graduate degree they are still mentored by clinical supervisors or clinical support teachers;
- a Teacher Enhancement Program is offered which provides teachers with either a master's degree and/or a supervisor's certificate--the entire program being coordinated by clinical faculty (Particularly interesting in this program is the fact that teachers pay $7000 for this program and there are takers every year).

One of the researchers remembers walking into a 7th grade classroom at one of ***Texas A&M's*** *"early versions of a PDS." " I walked in on a science lesson where a*

university faculty member, the teacher, two university students and a whole herd of kids were hovered around an experiment. I thought to myself, 'Who is generating the excitement about learning here?'"

Category 4: Resources of Money and Time

What does it take to keep a good partnership in tact and effective? Many measure success in the amount of time and resources devoted to partnership schools. Time and money indicate commitment from all partners and may indicate that consensus between the partnership has been achieved. Commitment can also be measured in the contributions of human resources. Superintendents, university presidents and deans, principals, faculty, parents and students are all part of the formula.

Some partnerships have been in existence for some time and their histories provide examples of resource contributions. In 1967 the **University of New Mexico** started one with Albuquerque schools--an exchange of service agreement--sending first year teachers to APS classrooms and experienced teachers to team teach courses at UNM and to support/supervise students in elementary licensure and graduate programs. Then in 1984 UNM invested in the process and hired their first seven clinical supervisors for the secondary program to team teach preservice and student teaching courses. The APS and UNM jointly select the clinical faculty who serve in this role for two years before rotating back to the classroom.

TEI partners sometimes find that for individual schools the PDS experience may be too intense and demanding to expect long-term commitment from a particular site. Instead, they discuss early in the relationship a reasonable time frame for all parties. **George Mason,** for example, phases sites out after five years and assigns new roles to those teachers experienced with the partnership. **Montclair State** asks for an initial three-year commitment from partner schools.

Technology has been the basis of resource commitment in some instances. The infusion of technology to improve classroom instruction is crucial for networking among

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

partner schools, sharing ideas and studying systemic change. **Texas A&M's** Somerville Junior High School, a small rural school, became a testbed for radical restructuring thanks in part to its extensive use of distance learning for both teachers and students. Here a great deal of networking with regional and other TEI sites involved in similar partnerships enabled many to feel part of a much larger endeavor. The **University of Wyoming,** being the only teacher education institution in the state, has developed a Statewide Partnership Board, and through the effective use of distance learning is currently involving in its partnership schools that educate 70% of the state's children. Remarkably this has developed into the simultaneous training of preservice and inservice teachers as well as parents through both compressed video and interactive computer. Each of these sights has contributed technological resources to insure simultaneous reform.

There is no question that acquiring resources for partnerships can be challenging or even problematic. Sites in the TEI, such as the **University of Wyoming,** have benefited from a combination of broad-based community and business grant support, as well as foundation and private funding. Still others have benefited from progressive legislation providing state-supported grants for school-university partnerships. The senate bill which awarded **Texas A&M** money over three years to develop Centers for Professional Development and Technology (CPDT) encouraged and expanded the network of schools that would become partners at various levels. In particular, this funding provided the addition of hundreds of computers and multi-media instructional set-ups; and a dozen compressed video sites were established so that the dialogue so critical to renewal could take place regularly at various schools.

Several sites mentioned obtaining federal money and other public sources as crucial to their development. Tennessee's Department of Energy grant is now providing additional funds to the **University of Tennessee**, besides those from the Lyndhurst Foundation, to prepare second career mathematics and science teachers. Literally several hundred have been served. **Texas A&M's** three-year Department of Education grant to South Knoll

Elementary School has enabled nearly twenty teachers to receive stipends for planning, teaching, serving as school/university liaisons and for evaluation.

In reflecting on what preceded their being awarded a $900,000 technology grant in 1994, the professor from the ***University of Memphis*** *recalls that summer when "I had different plans." She describes being asked to lead an effort to involve teachers from the partnership in a grantwriting effort. "At first my impression was that they were very timid at that process." "But they showed up at the first meeting and they wanted to work. I had to go through with this!"*

A couple months and many meetings later, she remembers sitting with teachers at a conference table "...with my head down and my hands down; we were all so tired, but couldn't quit yet." Later that summer they got word that their efforts had paid off. What emerged was not only an innovative project to prepare teachers and university students in working in a "model technology classroom," but a significant shift in attitude and activity for a number of teachers. "They are writing grants all the time, says the professor." "Teachers saw themselves getting something significant out of the partnership."

An appealing model in terms of resources for school-university partnerships could be called the "no cost model." In the **University of New Mexico** partnership, Albuquerque Schools compared costs for staffing classrooms, covering the same number of classrooms with graduate interns at one-half the district cost, the cost of releasing veteran teachers to work full time in collaborative programs and paying half the cost of program coordinators and costs associated with secretarial services, travel and materials. The university figured in professor salaries and stipends. When all benefits and expenses were examined, the partners agreed--they had a "no cost model." Apparently this has been so desirable that even through some of the tightest fiscal times in the state, APS has maintained its funding commitment to the partnership.

<u>Collective Limitations, Barriers and Common Concerns</u>

This section begins with a quote (out of the TEI resource guide) from Bob Pines of Montclair State who describes what many of us know from our work in teacher education partnerships. Speaking of his partnership he says the greatest challenge was "supplanting the differing perspectives and practices of school-and campus-based teacher educators with a common culture of inquiry." Bob suggests an initial obstacle was *"overcoming the stereotypes which each group had of the other."* By dealing head-on with the theory-practice issue and allowing enough time for the partnership to work out its early stage conflicts, these problems will occur less frequently. Thus, the earlier mention of the importance of commitment of time as well as resources is apparent.

A teacher at Lake Agassiz Elementary School which is part of the ***University of North Dakota*** *partnership, talks of the importance of her partnership dissolving the territoriality and the stereotypes of professor and school teacher that typically exist. She describes how the Chair of the Elementary Education program at UND dressed up as Amelia Bedelia for the children and how a geography professor came dressed as the Cat in the Hat. She now physically walks her 24 students, "like a mother hen," to the University twice a year to visit the professors and their students. "One of our greatest realizations is that the practicing teacher has a lot to offer the university students; the university professor has a lot to offer children in the schools."*

This teacher had been working with university teaching interns at her school as a mentor. One day she was shopping at the mall and one of the students from her school brought her mother over and said "Mom, I want you to meet my teacher's secretary."

It is critical to mention that both *money and time can be limiting factors to many partnerships*, although as we have seen, they have been dealt with effectively at some sites. Money to pay school faculty to teach and mentor novice teachers is often a new cost to a partnership, as is the money for teaching replacement costs for university faculty's increased time at school sites. The additional cost of a site coordinator--be they school or university personnel--is another consideration. Almost as thorny as the money issue is the

time factor. How can the best mentor teachers continue to provide children with the same quality instruction while adding to their load the time-consuming tasks of mentoring university students and teaching methods courses to them? What support can be offered to teachers and how can time be structured to support partnership work?

The issue of *rewards* is another important factor for both university and school partners to consider. With the additional responsibilities of teacher education added to the usual ones for mentor teachers, what are the rewards? Are they monetary? Are they intrinsic? Or (more ideally) are they both? For university faculty the inevitable questions are: "To what extent will my involvement in school partnerships enhance or detract from judgments about my chances for tenure and promotion?" and "Will the time I spend in schools be appreciated back at the university when it comes to pay increases or faculty teaching and service loads?" Again, some sites stand out as having dealt effectively with these problem areas, although at least one site said it was easier to get school personnel to teach university students than it was to get university professors to teach (and thus model for preservice teachers) children in the schools.

The whole notion of the *intensity and balance of the partnership* is an issue that can create problems if it is not discussed openly. Will there be a balance between the rewards and benefits to the various sides in this partnership? Will the schools benefit as much as the university? Will the veteran teachers benefit as much as the novice teachers? How long can the same teachers and other participants do all that the partnership demands? Will non-partner schools in the same district as the partner schools be jealous of the partnership or can we share our benefits with others?

One of the greatest challenges common to large state universities in the TEI is the tension between the university's mission and the TEI principles. Often the mission involves accepting *large numbers* of qualified students, yet resources and faculty hiring may not keep up with the large numbers of preservice teachers. Anyone who has been involved in handling the logistics of field placements or the time-consuming details of partnership

schools knows that successful partnerships will not necessarily multiply or be sustained at the same rate that preservice teacher populations may be increasing. Thus, coming up with alternative models that at least resemble the quality field experiences of a partnership must be addressed. Sites described in this paper may range from having less than 80 final year student teacher/interns to nearly 800. Those with larger numbers may have a smaller fraction of their preservice students currently involved in partnership schools, although most sites seem committed to creatively expanding the effect of the existing sites--most often through effective communication as to what is working best and what is most transportable to other sites. This is where the critical use of distance learning for conferencing and the expanded involvement of school and university partners presenting at highly visible conferences continues to be an important contribution.

Despite the tough decisions and challenges facing all who embark upon these collaborative school-university partnerships, the TEI sites have revealed an array of success stories, clever innovations, and--perhaps most important--a tenacity and passion for the kind of continuous improvement all partners seem to acknowledge is desperately needed. As we look at the other eight guiding principles forming the framework of this initiative, we think of partnerships as the very "linchpin," the "umbrella" term, the centerpiece from which all other principles radiate and gain momentum.

Implications

Across the nation school districts and colleges or universities are forging new partnerships in an attempt to make more effective teacher and administrator education. This sometimes occurs by mandates of the state, encouragement of funding agencies, or the increasing visibility of the research and successful stories about the value of such partnerships-- not only for teacher and administrator education but ultimately for the learning of the children who are the object of ultimate concern.

Findings from this study may not be surprising or revolutionary in terms of their familiarity. They do, however, seem to confirm that successful school-university

partnerships are complex relationships requiring attention to a number of domains related to organizational behavior , the whole process of change, and adult development--of which a wealth of good research exists. We suggest those embarking on school-university partnerships in teacher education can benefit from our discovery of these common elements found within successful partnerships in this seventeen-site study.

Just as two members of this research team focused on partnerships in its study of the seventeen-sites, some of the NEA-TEI members focused on the other eight principles, each contributing a chapter to a monograph (Majors & Pines, 1997). Stimulated by the chapters (arranged by site) each site had written (NEA, 1996) about their perceived progress with the nine prinicples and the subsequent monograph (arranged by principle), we were well tuned to embark on the next step--a longitudinal study using the seven restructuring sites.

Part II The Seven-site Research Design and First-Year Results

Beginning with the 1995-96 academic year, a major component of the NEA-TEI Initiative was the comprehensive evaluation of the success of the restructured teacher education programs. This unique and ambitious project involves each of the seven restructuring sites employing a common set of instruments and methodologies to address, over a five-year period, the following four research questions:

1) How are the nine principles actually defined and interpreted to fit site-specific needs, interests and partner's views?

2) To what extent are the site-defined individual principles being implemented?

3) What are the effects of restructuring on the partner institutions (schools, college of education, and university) in terms of quality of instruction and field-based supervision, school culture/climate changes, role definitions and role changes, and other factors?

4) How does the ongoing restructuring effort influence the quality of teacher preparation as evidenced by efforts, career choices, and performance of candidates and graduates?

Representatives from the seven sites spent well over a year helping to prepare the multi-dimensional instruments, with the leadership of Steven M. Ross of the University of Memphis and Suzanne Howze of NEA. The current configuration of instruments (Compiled in The NEA Teacher Education Initiative Evaluation Manual, October 1995) includes: Mentor teacher surveys, Preservice teacher surveys, university faculty surveys, mentor teacher focus groups, preservice teacher focus groups, school administrator interviews, other interviews of key people involved from school districts, universities and schools, and a school culture measure. In addition, all sites collected historical/archival data to provide necessary background on particular sites studied. In some cases optional instruments were also used. Some of these will be used in the second year study by more sites as well. These include case studies, university administrator interviews, university faculty interviews, P-12 student interviews, parent surveys, and follow-up surveys of preservice teachers.

Analysis of the qualitative data was done at each of the seven sites. The quantitative data was analyzed in at the University of Memphis. An executive summary of the first year's results for the seven sites is below. (This 1995-96 data is viewed as "Pilot" and will not be directly compared in the four years to come--as the mentor teacher and preservice teacher surveys were modified considerably after feedback

Executive Summary

Data was collected from seven sites included in the Teacher Education Initiative. These sites were George Mason University, Montclair State University, Texas A&M University, the University of Memphis, the University of South Carolina, the University of Southern Maine, and the University of Wyoming. The University of South Carolina did not collect sufficient amounts of information for an appropriate synthesis of their data. consequently, this report is based on data from six sites.

For most sites, the local definitions of the nine principles adequately matched with the national definitions used by the Teacher Education Initiative. Unfortunately, many

participants at the sites were either unfamiliar with the nine principles or were confused by the national definitions of the nine principles. Based on the participants who chose to respond to this research question or who were familiar with the principles, the Partnership principle was reported to have a moderate to close match with the national definition. Leadership was also a moderate to close match with the national definition, as was Evaluation and Dissemination and Professional Development. Systemic Change External was a moderate match, however, a greater than normal number of participants stated they did not know enough to assess the match. Systemic Change Internal, Technology, and Teaching and Learning were mentioned as having a good match by some groups, and a weak match by other groups. This pattern of responses was present at multiple sites. The only principle that had a close match with the local and national definitions across most sites was Equity and Diversity.

The degree of implementation of these nine principles was also assessed at each site. The principles of Partnerships, Leadership Roles, Evaluation and Dissemination, and Professional Preparation and Development were perceived as being well implemented at most sites. Montclair State University and the University of Wyoming however, tended to rate these principles as being adequately implemented. Technology, Systemic Change External, and Equity and Diversity were perceived as being poorly implemented at most sites, primarily due to site demographics, communication, and funding issues.

Any analysis of the implementation of the principles must be tempered by the findings of the first research question. There was not always a close fit between the local and national definitions. The degree of fit between the local and national definitions will impact the degree of implementation of the national definitions, which were used in the surveys and focus groups.

Many sites felt that one effect of the partnership is an increase in the amount of time required by the partners. Mentor teachers and university faculty specifically identified increased time as an issue, but this is primarily due to the increased collaboration required

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

to make the partnership successful. Preservice teachers also mentioned an increase in the amount of time required by the partnership, but generally view it as a positive experience. They see the benefits to themselves and the children, and are willing to put in the extra effort. There is an increase in time expenditure by mentor teachers, preservice teachers and university faculty, but participants justify the increases by the beneficial effects on the children. Not only did collaboration activities require extra time, but travel time was also increased for some of the participants, however, the preservice teachers, mentor teachers, and university faculty did not perceive the impact of travel time as a major issue. Fortunately, school administrators and university administrators also are aware of the additional time commitment required for interaction and participation in the partnership. They are willing to recognize the additional effort with various reward systems, including release time.

The definition of roles and responsibilities has changed dramatically as a result of the partnership. Collaboration between all members of the partnership was cited most often as an impact of the partnership. Collaboration seems to be especially helpful in encouraging a shared vision for professional development of teachers, as well as developing a sense of trust. Once a vision is shared by all members of the partnership, efforts can be focused on other collaboration activities that support the shared vision. Working together with colleagues from different districts and from the university is particularly valuable.

Not only was collaboration between the school and university partners cited as a beneficial impact, but communication within and between school districts was viewed as a particularly successful component of the partnership. Cross institutional collaboration was mentioned at two sites. Multiple respondents cited the need for more communication between partners. This is especially critical when many individuals collaborate. The more partners in the collaboration, the more opportunity for miscommunication and discordant expectations.

Mentor teachers reported a sense of empowerment and renewal in their own teaching. Teachers convey a sense of increased confidence, professionalism, pride, and enthusiasm. These feelings seem to occur for a variety of reasons, but teachers repeatedly identify their interactions with the preservice teachers as the main impetus for these benefits. Partnering with the preservice teachers provides an opportunity to reflect more on their own practice and to explain teaching behaviors. Mentor teachers also learn new models of instruction from the preservice teachers. They share new ideas and encouragement receive from peers. Modeling quality of instruction and self evaluation were also benefits derived from the partnership. Interactions with university faculty also positively affected teacher empowerment and renewal. Not only were mentor teachers able to collaborate with university faculty regarding instructional models and share ideas in teaching, but mentor teachers also appreciate being regarded as peers by the university faculty.

The partnership fostered collaboration between university faculty, mentor teachers, and preservice teachers. The high visibility of this collaboration encouraged all partners to focus on teaching as a profession. As a result of this focus, school administrators now tend to pay more attention to teacher training and improving the teaching profession.

The quality of supervision provided by mentor teachers is also impacted by the partnership. Multiple sources (e.g. university faculty, mentor teachers, school administrators) commented that teachers are better trained and more involved in the instruction of preservice teachers than in the traditional education model.

Most mentor teachers and university faculty members concurred that the rewards offered for participation in the partnership are not adequate. They felt that the rewards had a positive impact, but were insufficient. The rewards listed were both intrinsic and extrinsic. The following list contains the rewards mentioned by mentor teachers, university faculty, and preservice teachers.

Mentor teachers:

- Opportunity for professional growth
- Extra help in the classroom
- Stipends
- Tuition reimbursement
- University privileges
- Personal satisfaction

University faculty

- University service points
- Priority in scheduling classes
- Consideration of PDS work in tenure and promotion decisions

Preservice teachers

- Preparation
- Experience
- Self-confidence

Employability

- High job placement rate (preference in hiring)

Opportunities for improvement

Schools were generally positive regarding the collaboration between schools and universities. This collaboration was so helpful that some school staffs indicated that they would like greater involvement in the school by the university faculty. Specific suggestions included participation in school faculty meetings.

Increased collaboration requires increased communication between all members of the partnership. Since educators are typically very busy people, opportunities for increased communication must be developed. One site mentioned creating a liaison position that would foster communication between partners and help clarify expectations. Other sites saw no need for a liaison position. In either case, increasing communication between partners is an opportunity for improvement

Some sites recommended more school/district involvement in the preparation of teachers. This comment was not mentioned at many sites, and may be related to specific schools rather than the sites as a whole.

University faculty mentioned that the least successful features of the program related to the lack of involvement of specialists in subjects such as art, music, and physical education. They also suggested greater involvement of the arts and sciences faculty at the university. Some university faculty also noted the tension between the demands of the partnership and the demands of the university. Once university faculty member stated, "I got a heavier workload, more travel, and less time to publish."

A consistent suggestion across all sites is an improvement in the rewards offered for participation in the partnership. Although the intrinsic rewards are important to participants, extrinsic rewards could be substantively improved. This would not necessarily include monetary compensation, but could include incentives such as opportunities for growth.

One group of stakeholders viewed as not being sufficiently involved were the parents and the community. Mentor teachers, university faculty, and school administrators repeatedly mentioned the need for greater involvement in the school partnership by parents and the community. Preservice teachers also felt that they needed work in this area. This situation may be due to interactions with parents and members of the community occurring less often than other educational activities. The infrequency of these interactions provides the preservice teachers and other teachers with less experience in this area.

Most sites reported an increase in the amount of time required of the preservice teachers. This increase is necessary for preservice teachers to participate fully in school activities. Although preservice teachers clearly understood the increase in time requirements, they reported it as a positive experience. The benefits outweigh the negative implications. Some mentor teachers indicated that preservice teachers need even more observation time in schools before they come into the PDS program. This increase in time

would enable preservice teachers to better bridge the gap between educational theory and practice.

Many sources stated that the school is supportive of the preservice teachers and helped them feel part of the school culture. Some preservice teachers disagreed with this perspective and stated that they did not feel respected as colleagues. Providing support to preservice teachers also involved providing feedback. Preservice teachers indicated mixed opinions when commenting on the feedback provided to them by mentor teachers. Some preservice teachers experienced fair, honest feedback from their mentor teachers, while others commented that mentor teachers did not communicate well with them.

Not all teachers were supportive of preservice teachers or the partnership.

Each partnership school identified specific classroom teachers to serve as mentors for preservice teachers. Those teachers chosen to be mentor teachers reported supportive and positive attitudes toward the partnership and the preservice teachers. Some teachers who were not chosen as mentor teachers reported feelings of jealousy as well as increased stress. These teachers feel left out and perceive that the university has imposed an agenda on the schools.

The quality of instruction offered by the preservice teachers also is impacted by the partnership. Mentor teachers, university faculty, and preservice teachers indicate that the partnership emphasizes a variety of teaching methods; technology, teaching for higher order reasoning, and use of alternative forms of assessment. Not only did this benefit students, it reinforced good teaching practices for preservice teachers. Some sites specifically mentioned the bridge between theory and practice when describing the impact of the partnership. Mentor teachers felt that preservice teachers were able to bridge that gap well, which had positive practical application and helped foster good self-evaluation. Mentor teachers commented that bridging the gap was best addressed through teacher research groups and through teaching and learning based on needs of the classroom students.

Collaboration is consistently reported as a substantive benefit for all participants in the partnership. Although collaboration has many positive features, there is a downside for preservice teachers. Preservice teachers now feel accountable to many different people in a partnership setting. The greater number of people collaborating, the greater the opportunity for miscommunication, different rules, and different expectations of what the preservice teachers should do. This situation can be a source of frustration for preservice teachers.

Comparisons of partnership preservice teachers with preservice teachers in other teacher education programs were overwhelmingly positive. When asked "Preservice teachers are better prepared to become effective teachers than other preservice teachers you have supervised in other programs," over 70% of university faculty and mentor teachers who responded to this survey item agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Mentor teachers and university faculty conveyed the belief that preservice teachers exhibit a greater comfort level in schools and are more confident, which is probably attributable to the increased amount of time spent in schools. Preservice teachers are frequently described as being more like first-year teachers, and the mentor teacher relationship was often characterized as team-teaching. Some university faculty stated that preservice teachers get more personal mentoring and support from their classroom teachers thando preservice teachers in traditional programs. Both mentor teachers and university faculty believed that partnership preservice teachers are better prepared than non-partnership preservice teachers to teach in most areas. This theme was reiterated in focus groups, surveys, and interviews. One mentor teacher commented, "the conversations and interactions I've had with preservice teachers indicates that they feel better prepared and more confident about their commitment to the teaching profession."

Other comparisons of partnership and non-partnership preservice teachers were not as positive as the responses from mentor teachers and university faculty. Montclair State University examined the case study data and found no differences between

partnership and non-partnership preservice teachers. Case study data is collected on 10-20 preservice teachers from partnership and non-partnership programs. Information is collected for five years via interviews, surveys, journals, etc., from a variety of sources (e.g. prèservice teachers, school administrators), yielding a longitudinal perspective for evaluation of the partnership. Montclair State University was the only site to compare case study data and make conclusions from the first year's data. The University of Memphis and the University of Wyoming also collected case study data (using only some of the available case study instruments), but neither made conclusions based on an in-depth analysis of the case study data.

Based on the Montclair State University case study findings, there were no differences between the partnership preservice teachers and preservice teachers from traditional teacher education programs. Out of the many potential differences (e.g. teaching methods, enthusiasm, classroom management abilities) that could have existed between them, none existed. There are three possible explanations of this finding. First, it is possible that the two types of teacher education programs produce virtually identical preservice teachers. In spite of the increased collaboration and adherence to the principles of the partnership, it is possible that the effects on preservice teachers are indistinguishable from the effects of other teacher education programs. This possible explanation is critical and could have important ramifications for the teacher education initiative. The second explanation is that finding differences between two groups depends largely on the choice of comparison groups. If the comparison teacher education program is practicing innovative strategies which are similar to the nine guiding principles of the teacher education initiative, it is not reasonable to expect any differences between the programs.

For example, the non-partnership teachers may be engaging in professionally related activities and may share some of the same professional priorities as partnership teachers. When non partnership teachers have the same professional priorities as partnership mentor teachers, there is less of a difference in the impact on the preservice

teachers from either program. The more similar the comparison groups are to the partnership, the fewer differences will be found between the programs. A second possible explanation for a finding of no difference is that the finding was from only one site (Montclair State University). Results from one site should not be taken as representative of the overall partnership. Other sites may use comparison groups that are appropriate for their sites and find significant differences between the partnership and non-partnership programs. Only as the comparisons are conducted at multiple sites will there be qualitative data available to address this issue. Thirdly, not only are these findings of no difference from only one site, they are also based only on the first year's data. As the partnerships have more time to mature (greater agreement between partners regarding vision, expectations, and roles, etc.), differences may begin to emerge between the partnership and non-partnership programs. Although these results are preliminary and from only one site, they serve to point our attention to a potential issue for future evaluation. This issue should be closely monitored in upcoming evaluations.

Mentor teachers did raise an interesting point when making the comparisons between partnership preservice teachers and preservice teachers in traditional programs. These comparisons should be based on similar expectations for each group of preservice teachers. However, some mentor teachers commented that partnership preservice teachers are held to higher standards than preservice teachers from traditional programs. These differing levels of mentor teacher expectations must be taken into account when analyzing the comparisons

Conclusion

Overall, the partnership has had positive effects on all partner institutions. Schools were generally supportive of the preservice teachers and comparisons between partnership and non-partnership preservice teachers were positive. Even though the partnership required greater time commitments from all partners, the benefits to students outweighed the negatives. Mentor teachers conveyed a sense of empowerment and renewal

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

from the partnership, especially regarding collaboration and interaction. The enthusiasm of preservice teachers and their willingness to try new teaching methods inspired mentor teachers to renew their own efforts both in the classroom and in developing themselves professionally. School administrators saw benefits for the schools in terms of a positive impact on school culture, identification of good prospective teachers, and a positive impact on the students.

Increased communication between partners is a critical need both for collaboration purposes and for the management of partner expectations. The case study data should also be closely monitored to examine potential differences between partnership and non-partnership preservice teachers. Rewards also should be examined at each site. Understanding both the intrinsic and extrinsic rewards will help sites formulate a more meaningful reward structure for the participants.

Perhaps the greatest contribution the Teacher Education Initiative provides for all participants is a sense of hope. A mentor teacher focus group in Wyoming summed it up best. "They expressed and displayed patience, perseverence, and hope regarding the work of the partnership and efforts to improve the profession generally, as well as the education of the students specifically."

Part III Texas A&M University's Use of the NEA-TEI Research

The present report describes the methods and results of the 1995-1996 evaluation of the NEA TEI program as implemented in Texas.

During the past six years, Texas A&M University has gone from working with one school partner to 11 school partners. The eleven partnerships are devoted to preparing new teachers and continuing the education of experienced professionals in a way that combine theory and practice. Three schools have been identified and recognized as Professional Development Schools. They were selected because of the maturity of the their partnerships and since their teachers are beginning to become involved in research and documentation of

their PDS activities. In addition, each of these schools already have identified professional development of preservice and inservice teachers as part of their mission. These three schools are:

South Knoll Elementary

South Knoll Elementary is a prekindergarten through fourth grade campus serving over 650 students. Since beginning the South Knoll Professional Development School, over 400 preservice teachers have been enrolled in the collaboratively taught courses at South Knoll Elementary and teaching evaluations and feedback have been very favorable. Results were noted in other ways, too. During the school year, South Knoll volunteers logged ten thousand hours of volunteer service with over seven thousand of those hours contributed by university students many of whom were involved in the collaborative methods course. As a result of this volunteer involvement, South Knoll was awarded the Outstanding Volunteer Program for Small Districts in Texas.

Two thirds of the classroom teaching staff at South Knoll is currently collaborating with university professors from Texas A&M University to team teach methods courses on site at the elementary campus. In addition to teaching undergraduate courses, sixty percent of the teachers currently serve as mentor teachers for undergraduate students, coaching them on a daily basis in the classrooms at South Knoll. This spring with the teachers' guidance, preservice teachers have spent 5,760 hours in contact with elementary students in the elementary classroom applying content and lessons demonstrated in the field-based method block.

Somerville Junior High School

Last year the state recognized Somerville Junior High School with a Texas Academic Achievement Award for improved test scores on the state achievement test. Integrated technology, interdisciplinary and thematic teaching units, cooperative learning, creative scheduling, group decision making, and an university collaboration function within the normal school day and become integrated into plans that promote student achievement.

Collaborative work at Somerville has included the development of interdisciplinary units and the addition of methods courses taught on site. Somerville teachers provide the leadership to help preservice teachers develop and use interdisciplinary units, and then guide them as they refine and polish the final presentation through repeated communication and interaction.

Crockett Elementary School

Crockett Elementary is a model inclusion school that is a part of Bryan (Texas) Independent School District (BISD). It has a student population of approximately 550 in grades Kindergarten through fifth. Its student enrollment is diverse and is representative of the 60,000 plus citizens residing in the City of Bryan. The Crockett Professional Development School accepts approximately thirty preservice teachers each semester with each enrolling in 15-18 semester credit hours of subject specific professional development methodological courses. All course instruction is delivered on the elementary school campus with some courses being taught by Crockett classroom teachers. During those times when the preservice are not attending college classes, they are in service to their assigned classroom teacher. They emerge from this semester's work prepared for their student teaching semester which follows.

Methodology

Instruments and Participants

During the 1995-1996 school year, multiple instruments designed to evaluate the NEA-TEI program were administered. The NEA-TEI evaluation sites included three schools. Of these schools, one was a Junior High, and two were elementary schools. The total population, three professional development schools, were surveyed. Focus groups, interviews, and surveys were used to gather data from participants in the program: mentor teachers, preservice teachers, school administrators, and university teachers. During the Spring of 1996, mentor teachers, university teachers, and preservice teachers from each of the schools in this study participated in answering the surveys on a volunteer basis. A short presentation of the general purpose of the study and the Teacher Education Initiative Guiding Principles was conducted by one of the researchers and questions regarding the study were answered before distributing informed consent forms and surveys. To insure anonymity for participants, each of the surveys distributed was coded to identify the respondent (by number) and school (by letter) to provide an audit trail for researchers to follow individual respondents from the initial surveys, and to identify their participation in Focus Groups, Case Studies, or other data collection sources over an extended period of time. The evaluation instruments described in the following section were used during the 1995-1996 school year.

Mentor Teacher Survey

The mentor teacher survey (research protocol Form B) contains 5 sections. Section 1 contains 12 questions about the nine guiding principles. Section 2 asks 5 questions about overall impressions regarding the strength and weakness of the program. Section 3 asks 13 questions about the type and amount of change from previous teacher education programs Section 4 is composed of 25 questions regarding the shared vision of participating partners, incentives, emphasis on higher-order reasoning as well as a comparison of partnership teachers with other preservice teachers. Section 5 contains basic demographic information. A total of 48 surveys were distributed to 48 teachers during faculty meetings. A total of 32 surveys were returned, resulting in a return rate of 67%. The surveys which were returned did not show any evidence of systematic bias, and seem to be representative of the total population of teachers who received the surveys.

University Faculty Survey

The university faculty survey (research protocol Form F) is composed of 5 sections. Section 1 addresses each of the nine guiding principles via a rating of the degree of implementation, and further comments regarding the fit between the national and local definitions of that principle. Section 2 contains 5 questions including an assessment of the overall strengths and weaknesses of the program, and how well partnership preservice teachers compared to preservice teachers in traditional programs. Section 3 addresses the degree and direction of changes in the roles of university faculty and preservice teachers required by the partnership (e.g., time required to do the work, need for administrative assistance). There are a total of 13 questions in this section. Section 4 asks about the shared vision of the partners, the emphasis on various teaching strategies, as well as a comparison of preservice teachers to other preservice teachers. Section 5 contains 9 questions regarding demographic information. A total of 10 surveys were distributed and 5 were returned, resulting in a return rate of 50%. The faculty members all had at least 1 year

of experience with the NEA-TEI program and were sufficiently involved with the program to provide evaluative feedback.

Preservice Teacher Survey

In the first section of the preservice teacher survey (research protocol Form I), preservice teachers are asked questions about each of the nine guiding principles, ranking the degree of implementation of each principle, as well as any general comments regarding the principles. In section two, they are asked about the strengths/weaknesses of the partnership, and ways to improve it next year. Section three addresses the direction and level of impact the partnership has had on the preservice teachers in different areas. Section four asks for ratings on items such as collaborative decision making by the participating partners and the use of alternative assessment practices. The final section requests demographic information. A total of surveys were distributed to 65 preservice teachers during after school meetings. A total of 50 surveys were returned, resulting in a return rate of 77%. The surveys which were returned did not show any evidence of systematic bias, and seem to be representative of the total population of preservice teachers who received the surveys.

Mentor Teacher Focus Group

The focus group instrument (Form C) contains 17 questions and begins with introductory/warm up questions regarding the mentor teacher's experience in teaching, and how the mentor teachers became involved with the Partnership program. Participants from each of the three school sites were asked to review the nine guiding principles and comment on the consistency of the national definitions with the definitions adopted at their schools. Focus group participants are also provided an opportunity to talk about ways the NEA - TEI has impacted them personally (e.g., development, networking). Participants are specifically asked how the partnership preservice teachers differed from preservice teachers in traditional preparation programs, and what impact the partnership had on the academic performance of students in schools. A total of 18 teachers were randomly selected to

participate in a focus group. The focus groups were conducted at each of the participating schools and teachers were not paid for their time. There was no systematic pattern of teacher participation that would potentially bias the focus group results. The teachers had at least one year of experience with the NEA-TEI initiative, and typically served as a mentor to approximately two preservice teachers per year.

Preservice Teacher Focus Group

Focus groups were conducted at all three schools with a total of 14 preservice teachers chosen at random from the general population participating. All preservice teachers had at least six months teaching experience, and had participated in all aspects of the NEA-TEI program. Preservice teachers are asked a total of 14 questions. Participants are asked to describe their experiences in teaching, and how they became involved with the partnership. They review the nine guiding principles and are asked if the principles had been discussed with them. They are also asked how well the national definitions matched the local definitions, and the degree to which the definitions were implemented. Participants respond to questions about their interactions with others (e.g. supervising teachers, school principal), and questions regarding the impact of the partnership in various areas such as work pressure, culture or climate of school, etc. Comments are also solicited on their overall preparation in areas such as involving parents, knowledge of subject area, using a variety of instructional methods, etc.

School Administrator Interview

One school administrator was asked to participate in the interview, beginning with a brief description of their background and experiences in education, and how they became involved in the current partnership. The school administrator had at least 3 years experience with the NEA-TEI program, and had sufficient direct contact with the program to provide valid evaluative feedback.

One school administrator was interviewed. Participants are asked to review the nine guiding principles and comment on the consistency of the national definitions with the

definitions adopted at their schools. Participants are asked to comment on the degree to which the guiding principles were implemented as part of the partnership. The impact of the partnership is also assessed in terms of professional and personal roles of teachers and school administrators, curriculum, and academic performance at the school. Participants are also asked to compare partnership preservice teachers with preservice teachers in traditional preparation programs.

Other Interviews

Other key players in the partnership were also interviewed about their perceptions of the partnership. A district superintendent, central office administrators, school principals and parents were interviewed using an open-ended protocol found in Appendix F. Taped interviews were transcribed and analyzed for emergent themes.

Demographics for survey respondents (Mentor Teachers, University Faculty, Preservice Teachers) are shown in Tables 1-4.

Table 1. Age of Survey Respondents

Respondent Group	25 or younger	26-35	36-45	46-55	56 or older
Preservice Teachers	67%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Mentor Teachers	4%	14%	11%	10%	4%
University Faculty	0%	14%	1%	1%	1%

Table 2. Racial/Ethnic Group of Survey Respondents

Respondent Group	Asian/ Pacific Is.	Black	Caucasian	Other	Hispanic
Preservice Teachers	3%	0%	66%	1%	3%
Mentor Teachers	0%	0%	38%	0%	0%
University Faculty	0%	0%	3%	1%	0%

Table 3. Sex of Survey Respondents

Respondent Group	Female	Male
Preservice Teachers	66%	3%
Mentor Teachers	36%	3%
University Faculty	3%	1%

Table 4. Years of Teaching Experience of Survey Respondents

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Respondent Group	Average Number of Years
Mentor Teacher	16
University Faculty	

Table 5. Grades Currently Taught by Survey Respondents

Respondent Group	Elementary School	Middle School	High School
Mentor Teachers	91%	9%	0%
Preservice Teachers	85%	15%	0%

Table 6. Years of Experience with the Current Partnership Program

Respondent Group	Average Number of Years
University Faculty	1.7
Mentor Teachers	2.2

Table 7. Partnership Roles in the Past Three Years

Respondent Group	Classroom Practicum Supervisor	Taught teacher education courses	Supervised Preservice Teachers	Liaison professor	Other Roles
University Faculty	17%	22%	36%	0%	25%
Mentor Teachers	50%	25%	0%	25%	0%

Data Analysis and Results

Data Analysis:

Data from each of the individual surveys distributed in the Spring were assembled and recorded on a master response sheet. Two types of data were collected: numerical ratings and written comments. Numerical data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and written comments were analyzed for content using qualitative data analysis techniques.

The qualitative analysis of written comments was completed by teachers in the partnership working together in a collaborative research team. Classroom teachers from each of the three Professional Development School sites in partnership with Texas A&M reviewed and organized the data. These teachers, and several undergraduate and graduate students, were divided into smaller working teams with representatives from each site. The teams read individual responses to each open-ended question and organized them into what could be determined as separate pieces of discrete data (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Erlandson, Harris, Skipper, & Allen, 1993) or complete thoughts. The data was then

placed on numbered 3x5 cards and identified by the respondents' code number. For example, each respondent who submitted a survey had a number that referred to the individual and school (5L). If an individual had more than one discrete comment in response to a question, these were numbered accordingly (5L, 1; 5L, 2). Section, number, and letter of the question (I, 3, b) were recorded on the cards. The original surveys were used as a reference to double check accuracy of data. This disaggregation of data facilitated the inductive review of the responses to open-ended questions.

An open analysis procedure was used to process the data. Teams reviewed the responses to identify and formulate any and all ideas, themes, or issues they suggested and created categories that best reflected those comments. Once a consensus was reached within a team, category titles were selected. The card numbers and code number were listed for each category, and a short justification for categories was written. A second team reexamined the responses using the same procedure. Any disagreements in choice of category titles or the responses placed within them were discussed and recategorized when a consensus was reached. The disaggregated data thus was reduced from individual responses to a master document listing categories and frequency of responses within each category (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

A careful review of the categories was made to insure that future readers could understand the categories explicitly. Single words or short phrases were expanded for a clearer description of the data within a category. For each question the frequency of responses in each category was converted to a percentage of responses. The data, frequencies and percentages, were converted to tables for analysis. Responses to open-ended responses can be reviewed for the character of the response, the frequency of similar responses, and the percentage that those responses represent in the overall picture.

The qualitative nature of the data collected from the survey questions required examination of multiple sources of the data to provide triangulation and credibility to any findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) generated in the study. The survey data were further

defined by focus groups and interviews with participants which were tape recorded and later transcribed in their entirety. Data were analyzed first by instrument and then individual instrument summaries, which contained content and statistical analyzes, were compiled. See Appendices A-H for these summaries.

Tables were then created to show how various respondent groups answered the research questions:

Question 1: How are the nine principles defined?

Question 2: To what extent are the principles being implemented?

Question 3: What are the effects of restructuring in accordance with the nine principles on the partner institutions (school, college, and university)?

Question 4: How does the ongoing restructuring effort in accordance with the nine principles result in improvements in the quality of teacher preparation as evidenced by effects on candidates and graduates?

Data for the tables were gleaned from both content and statistical analyses of pertinent sections of whichever instrument was administered to a particular respondent group. Many of these tables are included in the appendices and referenced in the appropriate section of the report.

Results

Statistical analyses from the surveys form the bulk of the findings. Analyses of comments from the surveys and comments gleaned from the focus groups and interviews are used to explain what is meant by the statistical analyses or to show contradictory findings. Specific sections of the research instruments are denoted to show where the findings for each question were gathered.

Findings

Question 1: How are the nine principles defined?

Data to answer this question were taken from the following sections of the various research instruments:

Mentor Teacher Survey: Section I

Mentor Teacher Focus Group: Question 3a, 3b

School Administrator Focus Group: Question 4

University Faculty Survey: Section I

University Administrator Interview: Question 3

Survey respondents were not asked to give a quantitative rating for the fit between local and national definitions for the nine principles. Instead, they were asked to comment on the fit. Based on these comments, it appears that the philosophy of the Professional Development School at Texas A & M University embodies the national definitions of the guiding principles. (See Appendix G for the list of nine guiding principles.) However, there are a few differences in the way the principles are operationally defined. Overall observations are listed below; for a detailed look at the similarity between local and national definitions by survey respondent group, see **Appendix H**.

- Local definitions appear to have a generally close fit with the national definition in most instances. A weaker fit exists with Principle 5, Systemic change external. Principle 7, Technology, responses indicated definitions were not consistent and differed somewhat among respondent schools.
- The degree to which the local definition is perceived to fit the national definition is somewhat equally divided among university faculty.
- Principle 1, Partnerships, was considered to be a close fit by 79% of the mentor teachers and 60% of the university faculty survey respondents.

- Principle 2, Leadership Roles, was considered to be a close fit by most of the mentor teachers surveyed. The responses were split 50/50 among the university faculty.
- Principle 3, Evaluation and Dissemination, was given a close fit by 83% of the mentor teachers surveyed and 50% of the university faculty surveyed.
- Principle 4, Professional preparation and development, was considered a moderate/adequate fit by 66% of the university faculty and a close fit by 33% of the university faculty. 81% of the mentor teachers felt there was a close fit between national and local definitions. 9% of the mentor teachers indicated a moderate/adequate fit and only 5% maintained that the fit was weak.
- Principle 5, Systemic change external, responses were varied for both the university and mentor teacher levels. The university faculty divided 50/50 between a close and a weak fit. 33% of the mentor teachers felt there was a close fit with 67% indicating a weak fit.
- Principle 6, Systemic change internal, according to 50% of the university faculty, has a weak fit, 25% rated the definition a close fit and 25% rated it a moderate/adequate fit. Mentor teachers rated Principle 6 as a close fit 83% of the time and a weak fit 11% of the time.
- Principle 7, Technology, received a weak fit from 80% of the university faculty. Mentor Teacher respondent reactions were mixed. 68% rated it a close fit, 21% rated is a moderate/adequate fit and 11% give it a weak fit.
- Principle 8, equity and diversity, received 100% close fit from university faculty and 75% close fit from mentor teacher respondents. Further, 13% of mentor teachers gave principle 8 a moderate fit and 12% gave it a weak fit.
- Principle 9, teaching and learning, received a weak fit by 66% of the university faculty with the remainder indicating a close fit. 94% of the mentor teachers registered a close fit between national and local definition of Principle 9.

Question 1B: To what extent are the principles being implemented?

Data to answer this question were taken from the following sections of the various research instruments:

Mentor Teacher Survey: Section I

Mentor Teacher Focus: Question 3 a, 3 b

School Administrator Focus Group: Question 4, 5

University Faculty Survey: Section I

University Administrator Interview: Question 4, 4a, 4b

Preservice Teacher Survey: Section I

- All of the nine guiding principles are being implemented to at least an adequate/moderate degree according to survey respondents. In many cases, university faculty were split 50/50 on the rate of implementation while most mentor teachers generally rated implementation as high.

Table 8. Implementation of the Guiding Principles: Mean Ratings

Mentor Teachers, University Faculty, and Preservice Teachers were asked to rate the degree to which each of the NEA-TEI principles had been implemented in their local program. The table displays mean ratings for each respondent group. The means exclude any "Don't Know" ratings. The rating scale was as follows:

Low (1)
Adequate/Moderate (2)
High (3)
Don't Know (4)

Principles	University n=5	Mentor n=41	Preservice n=50
1. Partnerships	2.60	2.89	2.77
2. Leadership Roles	2.40	2.93	2.98
3. Evaluation & Dissemination	2.00	2.64	2.82
4. Professional Preparation & Development	2.60	2.70	2.94
5. Systemic Change External	1.50	2.18	2.50
6. Systemic Change Internal	2.00	2.71	2.95
7. Technology	1.75	2.47	2.37
8. Equity & Diversity	2.80	2.56	2.86
9. Teaching & Learning	2.40	2.85	2.84

- The principle that was rated by both Mentor Teacher and Preservice Teacher survey respondents as being most effectively addressed was 2 (Leadership Roles). Mentor teachers also felt 1 (Partnerships) and 9 (Teaching and Learning) were most effectively addressed by the Partnership while Preservice Teachers felt 6 (Systemic change internal) was another principle most effectively addressed. University Faculty rated principles 8 (Equity and Diversity); 1 (Partnerships) and 4 (Professional Preparation and Development in the top principles.

Table 9. Rank Order of Principles Most Effectively Addressed by the Partnership

(Note: The percentage shows the percent of times each principle was mentioned.)

Mentor Teachers (n=32)	University Faculty (n=5)	Preservice Teachers (n=50)
4. Professional preparation and development (24%)	4. Professional preparation and development (20%)	4. Professional preparation and development (29%)
2. Leadership roles (16%)	8. Equity and diversity (20%)	9. Teaching and learning (16%)
9. Teaching and Learning (16%)	1. Partnerships (10%)	1. Partnerships (13%)
7. Technology (11%)	2. Leadership Roles (10%)	2. Leadership roles (11%)
1. Partnerships (11%)	7. Technology (10%)	8. Equity and diversity (11%)
3. Evaluation and Dissemination (10%)	9. Teaching and learning (10%)	6. Systemic change internal (6%)
6. Systemic change internal (6%)	5. Systemic change internal (0%)	7. Technology (5%)
8. Equity and Diversity (6%)	3. Evaluation and dissemination (0%)	3. Evaluation and Dissemination (5%)
5. Systemic change external (0%)	6. Systemic change external (0%)	5. Systemic change external (0%)

- Respondents who were either interviewed or participated in focus groups also commented on principles that were most effectively implemented.

Table 10. Rank Order of Principles Least Effectively Addressed by the Partnership

(Note: the percentage shows the percent of times each principle was mentioned)

Mentor Teachers n=32	University Faculty n=5	Preservice Teachers n=50
5. Systemic Change External (35%)	5. Systemic Change External (29%)	7. Technology (32%)
8. Equity & Diversity (18%)	3. Evaluation & Dissemination (29%)	5. Systemic Change External (26%)
3. Evaluation & Dissemination (10%)	6. Systemic Change Internal (14%)	1. Partnerships (15%)
6. Systemic Change Internal (10%)	7. Technology (14%)	3. Evaluation & Dissemination (9%)
7. Technology (10%)	9. Teaching & Learning (14%)	2. Leadership Roles (4%)
9. Teaching & Learning (7%)	1. Partnerships (0%)	4. Professional Preparation & Development (4%)
1. Partnerships (3%)	8. Equity & Diversity (0%)	6. Systemic Change External (4%)
2. Leadership Roles (0%)	2. Leadership Roles (0%)	9. Teaching & Learning (4%)
4. Professional Preparation & Development (0%)	4. Professional Preparation & Development (0%)	8. Equity & Diversity (2%)

- Mentor Teacher, University Faculty and Preservice Teacher survey respondents rated principle 5 (Systemic Change External) as the least effectively addressed principle. University Faculty also rated principle 3 (Evaluation and Dissemination) and principle 6 (Systemic change external) as least effectively addressed. Preservice Teacher survey respondents rated principle 3 (Evaluation and Dissemination) and principle 7 (technology) as the second least effectively addressed principle.
- Respondents who were either interviewed or participated in focus groups also commented on principles that were least effectively implemented.

Question 3: What are the effects of restructuring in accordance with the nine principles on the partner institutions (school, college, and university)?

Data to answer this question were taken from the following sections of the various research instruments:

Mentor Teacher Survey: Section II, III, IV

Mentor Teacher Focus Group Questions 4-13, 15-18

School Administrator Focus Group: Question 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, 16

University Faculty Survey: Section II, III, IV

University Administrator Interview: Question 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12

Preservice Teacher Survey: Section II, Question 1, 2, 4

School District Superintendent Interview: Question 2, 3, 4, 5

The findings are grouped below by specific indicators and represent the comments of at least one group of respondents (and usually more). General findings are listed here. For a more detailed look at how each group of respondents felt about a certain topic, see one of the following three appendices.

Appendix K is a table that lists each of the indicators and shows which group of respondents commented in this area; this table represents comments gathered from all of the instruments;

Appendix I provides a set of tables that show mean ratings for each respondent group that was asked to rate the direction of change/impact (if any) when comparing the current Partnership with past traditional teacher education programs; means that are 2.75 to 3.74 show "few or no changes/impact"; means that are 3.75 to 4.74 show "some positive changes/impact"; and

Appendix J shows mean ratings for each respondent group that was asked to rate the extent of agreement or disagreement with a series of statements regarding aspects of the program not covered in other areas of the survey; means that are 2.75 to 3.74 indicate that respondents are "undecided"; means that are 3.75 to 4.74 indicate that respondents "agree"; and means 4.75 50 5.74 indicate that respondents "strongly agree."

Vision of the Program

- Mentor Teachers, University Faculty, and Preservice Teachers generally agreed that program participants share a common view of the program goals. See Appendix J for a table of mean ratings for survey respondents.

Time

- Mentor Teachers saw changes in time commitments as mostly positive for themselves and Preservice Teachers.
- University Faculty saw few or no changes in their time commitment and generally agreed that the change for Preservice Teachers was negative.
- Preservice Teachers reactions were divided somewhat equally both negatively and positively.
- Preservice Teachers commented that while more time was required of them, they felt it was a positive experience and beneficial in their preparation.

Travel

- Mentor Teachers were divided between few/no changes and major positive changes. Their responses for Preservice Teachers' changes were somewhat equally divided among all categories.
- University Faculty reactions were divided equally between negative change, no change and positive change with 40% of the University Faculty having no answer.
- Preservice Teachers generally felt there was few/no change in travel or major positive changes. They commented that they found travel time was used beneficially while some found it time consuming.

Human Resources (role definitions and role changes)

- Most Mentor Teachers found there were few or no changes and the next largest response indicated some negative changes in the need for administrative assistance. The majority of the Mentor Teachers responded that they did not know about the change for Preservice Teachers in this area.
- Mentor Teachers commented that they felt a need for more communications between the university and the teachers and needed a liaison. They felt it placed extra demands on administration and it was hard to coordinate the program. Mentor

Teachers also replied that there was a need for a liaison for the Preservice Teachers also.

- University Faculty saw few/no changes or some positive changes in the need for administrative assistance. Their reaction was mixed for preservice teachers. Like the Mentor Teachers, they agreed that there was a need for more communications between university and teachers.
- Preservice Teachers responded in every category except for major negative changes. Preservice Teachers commented that the staff helped them work out their schedules and they found no problems. Only 8% felt there was a need for more communications.
- School Administrator Focus Group commented on the need for improvement of school-university communications.

Reward Systems

- Mentor Teachers noted mostly positive changes due to rewards/incentives for themselves as well as the Preservice Teachers. Mentor Teachers felt rewards/incentives allowed them opportunities for professional growth and extra help in the classroom. It also gave them an "extra personal day." Most felt rewards/incentives provided student teachers with a means of being better prepared for teaching.
- University Faculty noted there was either no change or positive change for themselves and for preservice teachers.
- All University Faculty felt the rewards and incentives were not adequate.
- Preservice Teachers saw a major positive impact in the reward/incentives for participation in the Partnership. They classified their reward as preparation, experience, self-confidence and employability.
- Mentor Teachers are vary between disagree and strongly agree as to whether school faculty receive adequate incentives for their participating.

Bridge Between Theory and Practice

- Mentor Teachers and University Faculty responded positively to changes in connections between theory and practice both for themselves and Preservice Teachers.
- Mentor Teacher comments indicated that the bridge between theory and practice helped to foster self evaluation and had practical application and that Preservice Teachers showed evidence of theory in their practice.
- University faculty felt there was some positive change for them in the connection between theory and practice.
- Mentor Teacher Focus Group commented that this was implemented best through teacher research groups. Another strong area was teaching and learning which was based on the needs of the classroom students.

Finances and Material Resources

- Mentor Teachers generally agree that there are sufficient supplies and equipment to accomplish the Partnership objectives.

School Culture/Climate Changes

- Mentor Teachers indicated mostly positive changes for both Mentor Teachers and Preservice Teachers.
- Mentor Teachers reported finding a positive environment with increased professionalism. Some indicated that the training for teachers was better.
- Most University Faculty there were positive changes for the university faculty with a small percentage indicating no change. The majority of University Faculty felt there was positive change for Preservice Teachers.
- Preservice Teachers indicated mostly positive impact, commenting that elementary students received benefits and that Preservice Teachers learned to deal with many different people.

- Mentor Teacher Focus Group and School Administrator Focus Group reflected on the increased professionalism of teachers and administrators observed on their various campuses.

Work Pressure

- Mentor Teacher opinions were mixed, with some responding in every category. The majority stated there were few or no changes for the Mentor Teachers. They reported in all categories for Preservice Teachers, with the majority noting negative changes for Preservice Teachers.
- The majority of University Faculty felt no changes for themselves and some negative changes for Preservice Teachers.
- Preservice Teachers reported mostly negative impact with the next largest group reporting some positive impact. Their comments include that the requirements for courses was heavy and the time requirements were extensive. Some remarked that it was stressful while a few replied that the work expectations were realistic.

Quality of Instruction

- Mentor Teachers record mostly positive change for themselves and for Preservice Teachers. University Faculty felt there were few/no changes to major positive changes. Changes for preservice teachers were positive according to University Faculty.
- The majority of Preservice Teachers noted some positive impact to major positive impact as the effect on the quality of instruction.
- Comments from Mentor Teachers included the sharing of new ideas and encouragement from peers. Mentor Teachers also said that modeling quality instruction and self evaluation were benefits for them. They felt that preservice teachers were better prepared for real life teaching.
- Interpretation varied on this item. Some Preservice Teachers interpreted the effect on the quality of instruction for elementary students in the classroom while other

interpreted it to mean for themselves as college students. Some Preservice Teachers commented that the classroom students benefited from the program. Others remarked that they personally found the clinical environment beneficial. Many gave no comment.

- Mentor Teacher Focus Group and University Administrator Interview commented that professionalism has been heightened because of the partnership program.

Quality of Field-Based Supervision

- Mentor Teachers found few/no changes or positive changes. For preservice teachers, Mentor Teachers found the same with the exception of a small percentage of major negative changes.
- University Faculty responded with positive changes for the faculty and for Preservice Teachers.
- Preservice Teachers viewed the quality of field-based supervision as having mostly positive impact with a small percentage indicating some negative impact.
- The majority of comments from Preservice Teachers included receiving adequate feedback and evaluation. A small percentage felt that more time was needed in emphasis field and that more supervision was needed.
- Comments from Mentor Teachers about changes for Preservice Teachers include structural observation and real life experiences were given Preservice Teachers while one negative comment indicated no supervision.

Impact of the Multi-Site Network

- Table 11 shows the effect of the network on the various survey respondent groups.

Table 11. The Effect of the Network on Respondent Groups

Respondents	Percent Experiencing Some Effect	Percent Experiencing No Effect
Mentor Teachers	17%	83%
University Faculty	33%	66%

Question 4: How does the ongoing restructuring effort in accordance with the nine principles result in improvements in the quality of teacher preparation as evidenced by effects on candidates and graduates?

Data to answer this question were taken from the following sections of the various research instruments:

Mentor Teacher Survey: Section II, IV

Mentor Teacher Focus Group: Question 14-18

School Administrator Focus Group: Question 9-16

University Faculty Survey: Section II, IV

Preservice Teacher Survey: Section II, Question 1-4; Section III, IV

The findings below are grouped by specific indicators and represent the comments of at least one group of respondents. For a more detailed look at how each group of respondents felt about a certain topic, see one of the following appendices:

Appendix I provides a set of tables that show mean ratings for each respondent group that was asked to rate the direction of change/impact (if any) when comparing the current Partnership with past traditional teacher education programs; means that are 2.75 to 3.74 show "few or no changes/impact"; means that are 3.75 to 4.74 show "some positive changes/impact;"

Appendix J shows mean ratings for each respondent group that was asked to rate the extent of agreement or disagreement with a series of statements regarding aspects of the program not covered in other areas of the survey; means that are 2.75 to 3.74

indicate that respondents are "undecided"; means that are 3175 to 4.74 indicate that respondents "agree"; and means 4.75 to 5.74 indicate that respondents "strongly agree;" and

Appendix L is a table that lists each of the indicators and shows which group of respondents commented in this area; this table represents comments gathered from all the instruments.

Time

- Mentor Teachers report both negative and positive changes for Mentor and Preservice Teachers. Mentor Teachers feel the program required more time but that the benefits outweighed the time requirement. They also report that Preservice Teachers are able to spend more time in the classroom.
- University Faculty see little change for themselves as a result of time requirements but some negative change for the Preservice Teachers.
- Preservice Teachers report a negative impact as a result of time requirements. However, an almost equal number felt a major positive impact. Although it required more time and work, it was a positive experience.

Travel

- Mentor Teachers, Preservice Teachers and University Faculty mostly agree travel had little impact on them.

Human Resources (role definitions and role changes)

- Mentor Teachers differed in their opinions of need for administrative assistance. The majority categorized their answer as few or no changes with some indicating negative changes and some indicating positive changes both for themselves and for the Preservice Teachers. Comments included a need for more communication between University and teachers and a need for liaison (between University and Mentor Teachers and Preservice Teachers.)

- University Faculty see some positive change and also comment that there needs to be more communications between University Faculty and Mentor Teachers.
- The majority of Preservice Teachers report they do not know about a need for administrative assistance. Some comment that the staff helped them work with their schedule. They also reported more communication was needed.

Reward Systems

- Mentor Teachers and Preservice Teachers report major positive impact from rewards/incentives. University Faculty were divided among few/no change and positive change. University Faculty commented that they felt the rewards and incentives were not adequate.

Bridge Between Theory and Practice

- The majority of Mentor Teachers agree that the connection between theory and practice results in positive change. They comment that it fosters self-evaluation and that evident of theory is observable in Preservice Teacher practices.
- University Faculty report few/no changes to major positive changes in the connections between theory and practice. They comment that it has practical application for university teachers.

School Culture/Climate Changes

- Most Mentor Teachers, Preservice Teachers and University Faculty agree that there are positive changes in the effect on the culture or climate of the school. A small percent of Mentor Teachers and University Faculty see some negative change for Preservice Teachers only.
- Preservice Teachers comment that the elementary students benefit and Preservice Teachers learn to deal with many different people.
- Mentor Teachers comment that culture/climate changes created a positive environment and increased professionalism. At the same time, it created some jealousy and increased stress and responsibility.

Work Pressure

- University Faculty saw major negative changes for university teachers and some negative changes for Preservice Teachers.
- The majority of Mentor Teachers report few or no changes as a result of work pressure, with some reporting degrees of change in each of the categories for themselves and for the Preservice Teachers.
- Mentor Teachers commented that there were more meetings and more paperwork. Preservice Teachers commented that their course requirements were heave and required extensive time.

Quality of Instruction

- University Faculty, Preservice Teachers and Mentor Teachers mostly report positive changes exist.
- Mentor Teachers commented on learning and sharing new ideas, encouragement from fellow teachers, and increased self-evaluation. They feel Preservice Teachers are better prepared.
- Preservice Teachers agree that the children benefit and the Preservice Teachers benefit from the experience.

Quality of Field Based Supervision

- Mentor Teachers, University Faculty and Preservice Teachers agree that the quality of field-based supervision produced positive changes. Preservice Teachers received adequate
  feedback and evaluation.

Quality of Clinical Experiences

- The majority of the Mentor Teachers and Preservice Teachers agree that the clinical experience has produced major positive changes. University Faculty agree there were some positive changes for faculty and major positive change for Preservice Teachers.

- Mentor Teachers noted changes in evaluation and intrinsic changes for themselves and more time for Preservice Teachers to be in the classroom.
- Preservice commented that the clinical experience was a great experience, better than traditional programs and that they felt more confident to student teach.
- Table 12 shows a comparison of Partnership Preservice Teachers' ability level with Non-Partnership Preservice Teachers.

Table 12. A Comparison of Ability Levels: Partnership Preservice Teachers vs. Non-Partnership Preservice Teachers

- Preservice Teachers believe they have been well prepared to teach. Table 13 shows Preservice Teachers' mean ratings for areas of teaching.

Respondents	Significantly More Able	More Able	No Different	Less Able	Significantl Less Able
Mentor Teachers	57%	34%	4%	0%	4%
University Teachers	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%
Preservice Teachers	93%	5%	0%	0%	2%

Table 13. Preparation of Preservice Teachers: Mean Ratings (Preservice Teachers)

The table below shows mean ratings for the extent of agreement/disagreement with a series of statements regarding the preparation of Preservice Teachers. This means exclude any "Don't Know" ratings. The rating scale was:

Strongly Disagree (1)
Disagree (2)
Undecided (3)
Agree (4)
Strongly Agree (5)
Don't Know (6)

I feel I have been well prepared to:	Preservice Teachers (n=50)
Teach in my subject matter	4.38
Involve parents and the community in developing/implementing school activities	3.71
Be sensitive to ethnic and cultural differences among students	4.85
Work cooperatively with colleagues	4.81
Implement and adjust instructional plans	4.85
Use a variety of instructional methods, including those that increase student interactions	4.81
Teach for understanding and higher-order reasoning	4.76
Manage classroom activities and deal effectively with discipline problems	4.64
Use alternative forms of assessment for evaluating student learning	4.58
Use technology as a teaching tool	3.94
Reflect on my own teaching and student learning	4.77
Balance the varied demands of teaching	4.46
Develop the long-and short-range plans to meet the development and academic needs of my students	4.44
Use inquiry to improve teaching and learning	4.64
Become an effecive teacher	4.75

- Mentor Teachers and University Faculty believe Partnership Preservice Teachers are well prepared in being more sensitive to ethnic and cultural differences among classroom students and that they can implement and adjust instructional plans. Mentor Teachers and University Faculty believe Preservice Teachers were not as well prepared in involving parents and community in developing/ implementing school activities and in using technology in the classroom.

Table 14. Preparation of Preservice Teachers: Mean Ratings

(Mentor Teachers, University Faculty)

The table below shows mean ratings for the extent of agreement/disagreement with a series of statements comparing the preparation of Partnership Preservice Teachers with preservice teachers from other types of teacher education programs. The means exclude any "Don't Know" ratings.

The rating scale was:

Strongly Disagree (1)
Disagree (2)
Undecided (3)
Agree (4)
Strongly Agree (5)
Don't Know (6)

Partnership teachers are better prepared than are other preservice teachers to:	Mentor Teachers (n=32)	University Faculty (n=5)
Teach in their subject matter	4.33	4.00
Involve parents and the community in developing/implementing school activities	4.28	4.00
Be sensitive to ethnic and cultural differences among students	4.47	4.67
Work cooperatively with colleagues	4.67	4.67
Implement and adjust instructional plans	4.48	4.67
Use a variety of instructional methods, including those that increase student interactions	3.42	3.67
Teach for understanding and higher-order reasoning	4.29	4.33
Manage classroom activities and deal effectively with discipline problems	4.24	5.00
Use alternative forms of assessment for evaluating student learning	4.45	3.67
Use technology as a teaching tool	4.39	3.67
Reflect on their own teaching and student learning	4.58	5.00
Balance the varied demands of teaching	4.61	5.00
Develop the long-and short-range plans to meet the development and academic needs of their students	4.21	4.67
Use inquiry to improve teaching and learning	4.47	4.00
Become an effective teacher	4.79	4.67

Discussion

Texas A&M University has formed a complex and comprehensive partnership with the three professional development schools in this project. Even though each of the schools is different in design and make-up, each school in the project has offered collaboratively taught methods' courses on-site the semester before student teaching to a cohort group of undergraduate students, created new leadership roles for preservice and inservice teachers, formed new relationships with university faculty, and participated in staff development for both in-service and preservice teachers.

Judging by the results of the study, the Professional Development Schools at Texas A&M University have contributed favorably to the preparation of prospective teachers. Results suggest that all participants share a common vision about the partnership and these goals are aligned with the Teacher Education Initiative's Guiding Principles. However, there is some indication that all participants share some concern about the lack of impact the partnership has made on the external system -- not only at the university, but in the broader educational arena as well. As one university faculty member wrote, "The results of the PDS program have not been shared or used to influence change at the state or national levels, even though other local schools have become interested." While participants believe the PDS to have re-created teacher education, the impact has only been felt within the local system and then only within a small entity of the total Texas A&M educational community. "Many people in the College of Education at Texas A&M University don't want to transform teacher education," wrote another university faculty member.

Results, however, indicate that most of the program goals are being implemented successfully. Mentor teachers, preservice teachers, and university faculty all believe the program is affecting their own professional development in a positive way, as well as the academic development of the students in the schools, although more research is needed to determine the actual benefits to students. Mentor teachers and preservice teachers are experiencing new leadership roles and feel the benefits, personally and professionally, of

the program outweigh increased time and work. University faculty are forming new relationships within the PDS setting that provides insights into their own teaching. Effective teaching and learning is the priority of all involved. As one university faculty member said, "Teaching on campus I did not have students who experience the same richness of experiences with children that provide for dialogue and debate within the course or questions that demonstrated a real grappling with the teacher/learner process."

All participants feel the increased time in the classroom for preservice teachers provides valuable "real world" experience and increases confidence in the future teachers. As one mentor teacher explained, "The PDS allows the university student to experience the complex world of teaching over a reasonable and realistic span of time. Children become the focus for developing techniques for teaching concepts and results are vividly observed by the university student." A university faculty member commented, "The pace of maturation is accelerated. Their ability to plan, deliver, and assess lessons and their own performance grows dramatically. They have the opportunity to be submerged in the culture of the school. They learn what children are really like and have the opportunity to work closely with them, see their improvement, and question everything they believe about teaching."

The success of the partnership is not only seen in the results of the study, but in the process of the data analysis. The collegial support and opportunity to share their professional expertise with new and experienced teachers, greatly contributed to the overall professional development of teachers involved. Teachers served as participant researchers so that "the analysis of the data interacted with the collection of the data" (Erlandson, 1993) in a unique opportunity the three sites in the partnership to share perspectives with each other. In doing so, the research team became a vehicle for sharing professional learning about partnerships and research with an emphasis on research informing practice. As the research team discussed and debated categories and comments, participants could see how their site compared to the other schools. As one participant said, "The

communication between the different sites gave us an idea on how we stacked up to the other schools and some of the things our program might be missing or some of the things we had included and other schools had not included." Teachers were also empowered by what they read. One teacher commented, "We're not just classroom teachers doing our own little things in those four little walls. We could see the impact of what were doing in teacher education by looking at this research. I like to know that I've made a difference and that my efforts are worth it."

Participant researchers also learned the process and procedures involved in analyzing qualitative data. "We often get feedback in comments from people in the hall, but to be able to systematically look at what people are saying and get an overall picture was very meaningful," said one teacher researcher. "It was interesting to see that even though it's based on open-ended questions, qualitative research is very systematic and has a great deal of structure to it -- it's not just whatever sounds good. There's a system to it and I wish everybody could see that." Teachers who participated in the data analysis felt their participation in the analysis of the data would have an impact on the quality of responses on the TEI surveys in the future. "People need to have some kind of understanding about the process and how what they say on that survey form impacts the research. They need to understand what we're going to do with it."

Even with all the success, the partnership is still viewed as fragile. Participants expressed concerns over the future funding and staffing of the partnerships, and some school-based personnel feel the university's commitment to the school partnerships diminishing. Communication is seen as a continual struggle and participants feel a liaison, who works effectively in both educational arenas, critical to the process of keeping all parties informed. Evaluation and dissemination is seen as a critical, but often overlooked, piece to the partnership which makes the involvement of all participants in the data analysis process so important. South Knoll Elementary has an active teacher research team on site addressing evaluation and dissemination on a regular basis, but the other sites do not

currently have this component in place. Without valid data, future decision makers will rely on perceptions rather than documentation.

Overall, however, the study suggests that the PDS program and Texas A&M University is graduating prospective teachers who are better prepared than those exiting from the traditional program. This closer linkage between teacher educators and public school professionals has, from all perspectives, produced graduates considered to be more able, if not significantly more able, to teach than graduates prepared in a non-PDS setting.

References

Auger, F. K. & Odell, S. J. (1992) Three school-university partnerships for teacher development. ***Journal of Teacher Education***, 43(4), 262-268.

Book, C. (1996) . Professional development schools. In J. Sikula (Ed.) Handbook of research on teacher education. (2nd ed.) (pp.194-210). New York: Macmillan.

Erlandson, D.A., Harris, E.L., Skipper, B.L., & Allen, S.D. (1993). Doing naturalistic inquiry. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Goodlad, 1995

Goodlad, J.I. (1996) . School renewal. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Holmes Group (1986). ***Tomorrow's teachers***. East Lansing, MI: Author.
Hunkins, F., Wiseman, D. L., & Williams, R. (1995). The Partner School: Centers of Inquiry. In R. Osguthorpe, B. Cutler, & (Eds.) ***School-University Partnerships***. Norward, N.J.: Ablex.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

National Education Association (1995) . Teacher Education Initiative: Guiding Principles. Paper provided to all TEI sites. Washington: National Education Association.

National Education Association (1996). NEA Teacher Education Initiative partnership: Program descriptions. Washington: NEA

Major, C. & Pines, R. (Eds.) (1997). Principles for School-University Partnerships: The National Education Association Teacher Education Initiative. Washington: NEA.

Schlechty, P. (1991). ***Schools for the 21st century***. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Shen, J. (1993) . Voices from the field: School-based faculty members vision of preservice teacher education in the context of a professional development school .

(Occasional Paper No. 16) Seattle: University of Washington, Center for Educational Renewal, Institute for the Study of Educational Policy.

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques. Newbury Park: Sage.

Teitel, L. (1992). The impact of professional development school partnerships on the preparation of teachers. Teaching Education, 4 (2), 77-85.

Teitel, L. (1994). Can school-university partnerships lead to the simultaneous renewal of schools and teacher education? Journal of Teacher Education, 45 (4), 245-252.

Wiseman, D.L. & Nason, P.L. (1995). The nature of interactions in field-based teacher education experiences. Action in Teacher Education, XVII (3), 1-13.